

From: Paul Tholfson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'd like to see this suit settled as quickly as possible. I don't understand the entire logic behind it. I have repeatedly read that the purpose of anti-trust legislation is to protect the consumer public. Yet all the objections to the settlement proposal seem to be based on protecting the competitors of Microsoft, at the expense of the consumer.

I've been a CPA for thirty years. During this time our firm has gone through the entire range of business software, beginning with Wordstar word processor, Visicalc spreadsheet, DBase-2 database, as well as the CPM and Apple operating systems. We made a number of costly migrations along the way, including Wordperfect, Lotus 123, R-Base, and Harvard Graphics. Eventually, and for the past six years, we have settled on all Microsoft software: Word, Excel, Access, PowerPoint and Windows operating system.

The point is that we did this for three very good reasons, and without any coercion:

- 1.. The MS products, while initially inferior to their predecessor rivals, gradually improved and overcame them.
- 2.. As more and more of our clients and other people with whom we do business apparently made the same choices, it became easier and easier for us to share files, send e-mail, etc.. It's hard to imagine how we made it in the days when there were at least half a dozen different and incompatible word processors, spreadsheets and databases available. In fact, the one relevant area which MS doesn't dominate is accounting software. Here, we're still faced with having to deal with over a dozen different packages, to the detriment of our clients.
- 3.. The cost of the software is negligible when measured against the utility and ability to improve our own efficiency.

Some of the demands I see being made by the plaintiffs and their witnesses seem absurd. The compatibility benefits resulting from Microsoft's dominance in office software is an obvious advantage to all users. To return to the relative chaos of multiple operating systems, and word processing and other office software in the hope of creating what some university economists see as a theoretically beneficial competitive environment, makes as much sense as requiring each telephone company to use its own incompatible communication system, or each railroad to select its own rail gauge.

This case should be settled as expeditiously as possible. If the US and Microsoft have come to an agreeable settlement, the Court should accept it and not prolong this case any further.

Paul Tholfsen

2626 South Park Drive

Bellingham, WA 98225-2524

360-734-9343

ptholfsen@netos.com